



RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE AGENDA
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 4, 2002

- CALL TO ORDER
- ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW

MINUTES:

PRESENT: COUNCILMEMBERS BROWN and MACK

NOTE: COUNCILMAN BROWN sat in for COUNCILMAN WEEKLY who could not be present.

Also Present: DEPUTY CITY MANAGER DOUG SELBY, CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED, CITY CLERK BARBARA JO (RONI) RONEMUS, and DEPUTY CITY CLERK GABRIELA S. PORTILLO-BRENNER

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE – meeting noticed and posted at the following locations:

Las Vegas Library, 833 Las Vegas Boulevard North

Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road

Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy

Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall

City Hall Plaza, Posting Board

(4:01)

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 4, 2002

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

ABEYANCE ITEM - Bill No. 2001-115 – Requires certain disclosures in connection with the sale of a residence or residential lot. Sponsored by: Mayor Oscar B. Goodman

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill would require a number of disclosures in connection with the sale of a residence or residential lot. Among the items that would have to be disclosed to the buyer are the zoning and land use classifications applicable to the property and surrounding areas, any existing or proposed gaming enterprise districts in the area, existing or proposed assessments, structural defects, and any soils reports regarding the property. Disclosures would have to be documented in writing or by videotape.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill was held in abeyance to the 3/4/2002 Recommending Committee meeting by the 2/19/2002 Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2001-115

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2001-115 be held in abeyance to the 3/18/2002 Recommending Committee meeting. COUNCILMAN BROWN concurred.

MINUTES:

NOTE: This matter was trailed until the arrival of MAYOR GOODMAN.

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing open.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2002

City Attorney

Item 1 – Bill No. 2001-115

MINUTES – Continued:

MAYOR GOODMAN apologized to the Greater Las Vegas Association of Realtors, through their representatives present in the audience, for delaying this matter. Fortunately, a meeting had been held that day and, with the Association's contribution, he felt that an effective ordinance could be drafted for presentation at the 3/18/2002 Recommending Committee meeting. This proposed ordinance will show a partnership between the realtors and the City that will assure disclosure of pertinent matters at the sale of new residences. He requested abeyance to 3/18/2002.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:01 – 4:02/4:14 – 4:17)

1-11/1-396

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 4, 2002

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

ABEYANCE ITEM - Bill No. 2002-24 – Amends the business licensing requirements for arts and crafts shows. Proposed by: Mark Vincent, Director, Finance and Business Services

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill permits vendors not selling arts and crafts articles to be present at arts and crafts shows. Business licensing fees will then be based on the combined number of exhibitors selling arts and crafts articles and vendors. The sale of used articles will be prohibited under the provisions of this bill, unless these articles have been altered into arts and crafts articles. Arts and crafts articles sold at a show must contain the signature or mark of the exhibitor.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill was held in abeyance to the 3/4/2002 Recommending Committee meeting by the 2/19/2002 Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-24

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2002-24 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation. COUNCILMAN BROWN concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing open.

JIM DiFIORE, Manager, Business Services, explained that this bill involves an amendment to Las Vegas Municipal Code, Chapter 6.1(1), and listed in detail those amendments.

WES ISABUT, 117 W. Charleston Boulevard, questioned why the changes are being made and whether there is a true need for them and to change the rates. MR. DiFIORE explained that the

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2002

City Attorney

Item 2 – Bill No. 2002-24

MINUTES – Continued:

City facilitating the process of arts and crafts shows is a money-losing effort at \$1 per event. Most events last two or three days. The code changes are necessary because the current code is outdated.

MR. ISABUT appreciated the necessary changes. However, he commented that arts and crafts shows are not a profit-making event and are more cultural. The people that are operating and running such events are more into philanthropy. For the City to try and make a profit makes it tougher for these people. MR. DiFIORE indicated that the fee is on an incremental basis, so the \$1 per day is essentially per exhibitor. The fee was not changed to make it more expensive, but rather to update the code, especially because of the larger shows.

MR. ISABUT argued that most of the artists and crafts people are standard university and college students and on a budget. The \$25 fee is going to discourage these types of events, and that is not worth the amount of money the City would gain. COUNCILMAN BROWN noted that the City is not in the business of making money. But it is trying to get to where there is not a continual lose of money across the board in all departments and all functions. Currently the City mostly loses money. The City cannot continue to be all things to all people.

MR. ISABUT commented that artists do not generally like to go through a lot of red tape, and requiring that an application be filled for each vendor would turn them away. Traditionally the person organizing the event fills out the application and obtains the permits for the entire event. MR. DiFIORE clarified that this bill would only require one application, not a separate application for each vendor. If there were 25 vendors, the operator would pay one fee for those exhibitors. COUNCILMAN MACK clarified that the \$25 fee would be for 25 exhibitors, not for each person. MR. DiFIORE confirmed that it is a fee of \$1 per vendor.

MR. ISABUT asked if it would be possible to obtain alcohol permits and arts and crafts show permits at the same time and link them together. MR. DiFIORE answered that the two individual permits are governed under different codes. The arts and crafts show permits are approved at the administrative level, while alcohol event permits are approved at the City Council level. But, although there are requirements, the process itself is not too cumbersome and people are informed up front of the requirements. In general, permits for art shows are processed within two days.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2002

City Attorney

Item 2 – Bill No. 2002-24

MINUTES – Continued:

COUNCILMAN BROWN suggested that MR. ISABUT confer with MR. DiFIORE on any concerns before the 3/20/2002 Council meeting when this bill is eligible for adoption.

COUNCILMAN MACK questioned the fee structure for arts and crafts shows as well as farmer's markets held in the parks. MR. DiFIORE replied that the Leisure Services Department has a standard contract for everybody who utilizes City parks and is based on a percentage of admissions. There is also a cleaning deposit and other fees that may vary depending on the show.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:02 – 4:14)

1-30

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 4, 2002

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

ABEYANCE ITEM - Bill No. 2002-31 – Revises the standards for the boarding, maintenance and rehabilitation of vacant buildings. Sponsored by: Councilman Michael J. McDonald

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

The City Code currently contains provisions regarding the boarding of buildings. It has been determined to update those provisions and to address the treatment of vacant and abandoned buildings generally. This bill will encourage the prompt securing, rehabilitation and lawful occupancy of such buildings by authorizing the City to perform the necessary work if the owner does not do so in a timely manner.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill was held in abeyance to the 3/4/2002 Recommending Committee meeting by the 2/19/2002 Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-31

Submitted at the meeting: a Proposed First Amendment

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2002-31 be forwarded to the Full Council without a recommendation. COUNCILMAN BROWN concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing open.

DEPUTY CITY MANAGER SELBY indicated that Neighborhood Services staff worked very hard on drafting this bill, which would revise the City's code regarding abandoned buildings and vacant properties in an effort to give the City more ability to deal effectively with those issues. Bill 2002-31 requires a notice of intent for abandoned properties so that the City will know the

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2002

City Attorney

Item 3 – Bill No. 2002-31

MINUTES – Continued:

intended use of that property in the future. Following that, will be a mitigation or rehabilitation plan submitted to the City. Inspection fees will be increased, and the City will maintain a database and an active inspection program.

The goal with this bill is not to have a lot of vacant and abandoned properties that look good, but to encourage the restoration and rehabilitation of such properties. It is one of the Council's priorities to maintain neighborhood integrity, and this bill would go a long way in that direction.

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED advised that language was included in the Proposed First Amendment providing for a statement of intent by the owner regarding plans for property identified by Neighborhood Services that has become vacant following the demolition of a building. The language includes a provision for appeal of an order to board a vacant building, as well as standards for landscaping. He noted that the bill does not address vacant property that has always been vacant, only property that has become vacant following the demolition of a building.

DOUG RANKIN, Liaison for COUNCILMAN McDONALD, indicated that one of the concerns with the amendment was to make sure that the landscaping of vacant properties be maintained in order to avoid blight in the immediate area. Provisions for dust abatement have also been added.

SHARON SEGERBLOM, Director, Neighborhood Services Department, noted that the bill will allow for a decent inspection system that does not cost the City. She indicated that currently vacant commercial buildings are one of the biggest problems. For example, the Texaco station at Charleston and Rancho where people were living in it. A temporary fence was put up, but around the landscaping which looks very bad. She pointed out that this bill allows Code Enforcement to work with property owners on figuring out a plan to enhance the affected neighborhood. There may be some neighborhoods where fencing is not wanted or appropriate.

AL GALLEGOS argued that the public does not want all these regulations. They would prefer a building abandoned for one year be taken down. He indicated that there is a house in his neighborhood with a chain-link fence around it that he is tired of looking at and asked how much longer he is going to have to tolerate its unsightliness. The weeds were removed, except in the planters. He reiterated that abandoned buildings should be demolished. He pointed out that one of the front yards of a house in the neighborhood is being used by the Neon Museum for parking. He urged the City to take action immediately, not six months from now.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2002

City Attorney

Item 3 – Bill No. 2002-31

MINUTES – Continued:

COLLEEN WILSON-PAPA, Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association, expressed the Association's support of aesthetically maintaining neighborhoods; however, the Association is concerned about getting caught up in vacant land provisions, especially when pulling demolition permits. Filing a statement of intent could delay the process even further, because there is a possibility of having to file a landscaping mitigation and rehabilitation plan 60 days later. The associated cost could also increase the cost of homes to the consumer.

MR. RANKIN stated that the mitigation plan could include a simple explanation; for example, the property will be redeveloped with a housing track. As long as that is acceptable to the Director, there is no problem. A provision could also be included to allow for appeals to the City Council.

MS. SEGERBLOM asked MS. WILSON-PAPA if her concern mainly involved landscaping and boarding of buildings. MS. WILSON-PAPA replied that the problem is the process and requiring additional reports while trying to deal with building and planning aspects. COUNCILMAN BROWN interjected that the fact a developer is involved in the building process addresses the City's concern. It is an indication that there are plans for the property. CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STEED noted that the homebuilders are not the target of this bill. A one-sentence statement explaining the plans for the property should be sufficient at the administrative level.

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STEED added that language could be included to Section 7-E of Page 5 allowing the applicant to appeal to the Council if the applicant is dissatisfied with or aggrieved by the mitigation plan. MS. SEGERBLOM expressed concern about including an appeal process which the targeted people could take advantage of to prolong the process. One of the main reasons the Council has been pushing for this bill is to speed up the current process. An appeal to the Council would take a long time to get on the agenda. CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STEED opined that the City should provide for appeal of the mitigation and rehabilitation plan that a Director has the discretion to require. He recommended a ten-day appeal process to the Council be included.

Given the discussion, COUNCILMAN MACK recommended the matter be forwarded to the Council with no recommendation.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:17 – 4:39)

1-490

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 4, 2002

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

Bill No. 2002-32 – Establishes a hardship determination procedure for persons whose property will be included within the boundaries of an improvement district. Proposed by: Bradford R. Jerbic, City Attorney

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

State law requires local governments to establish a hardship determination procedure for persons whose property will be included within the boundaries of an improvement district. This bill will establish such a procedure, modeled after those adopted by other local jurisdictions.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-32

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2002-32 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation. COUNCILMAN BROWN concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing open.

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STEED explained that this bill is in response to legislation adopted in 1999 and provides a procedure for hardship determination. The process allows someone who can establish a hardship to obtain relief from payments of principal and pay interest only until certain events occur to transfer the property.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2002

City Attorney

Item 4 – Bill No. 2002-32

MINUTES – Continued:

DAN CONTRERAS, Bonanza Village resident, asked if this would include the Bonanza Village Wall SID, which has not been approved or assessed. CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STEED indicated that it is tied to hearings on the assessment roll. LAURIE DUNFORD, Special Improvement District Division, confirmed that there have been several applications as far as Bonanza Village and that staff would accept applications up until three days before the public hearing scheduled for 4/17/2002.

MR. CONTRERAS commented that there are a lot of seniors in Bonanza Village that do not have any liquid funds. Owning their home is a matter of pride to them. With legal language being so difficult to understand, he urged the City to send letters with the SID to Bonanza Village residents thoroughly explaining the process to them so that they do not risk losing their homes. Last year, one of his elderly neighbors really stressed about losing his property. Also, he pointed out that even with a hardship status, payments are missed have to be made in no more than 20 semi-annual installments, which cover 10 years. However, the assessment for Bonanza Village residents is for 20 years, thereby, accelerating their payments.

MS. DUNFORD interjected that the hardship information is included in the SID notice as a three-page notice. Staff tried to include a brief summary in the cover letter explaining the availability of the hardship procedure. As far MR. CONTRERAS' question regarding social services, the City does not have a division that could assess whether a person qualifies for hardship status; therefore, the City has contracted with Clark County Social Services to make that determination.

NOTE: COUNCILMAN BROWN directed DEPUTY CITY MANAGER SELBY to work with the SID Division in putting together a public awareness brochure.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:39 – 4:46)

1-1251

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 4, 2002

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

Bill No. 2002-33 – Establishes temporary event business licensing requirements. Proposed by:
Mark Vincent, Director of Finance and Business Services

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill establishes a temporary event license for events of limited time to which the general public is invited. A flat license fee of twenty-five dollars per day plus five dollars for each exhibitor at an event will be charged. Current trade show license requirements will be merged with the temporary event license requirements. This bill also will increase convention license fees from seven dollars a day for each exhibitor to fifty dollars plus five dollars per day for each convention exhibitor.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-33

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2002-33 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation. COUNCILMAN BROWN concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing open.

JIM DiFIORE, Manager, Business Services, explained that this amendment to the current code came resulted from discussions with Cashman Center Management Group regarding the existing restrictions or limitations for a show to have additional vendors/exhibitors not part of the show theme. The request is to lift that restriction and provide a licensing fee structure applicable to anybody that goes into that particular show. Before licensing would be issued based upon the

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2002

City Attorney

Item 5 – Bill No. 2002-33

MINUTES – Continued:

categorized nature of the activity; such as arts and crafts shows, boat shows, or beauty pageants. This bill essentially replaces the term “trade show” currently in effect.

The current code also requires a daily \$7 per exhibitor fee. This bill would reduce that fee to \$5 per day based on staff’s informal studies, which found that, given the number of shows being held, the change would be revenue neutral and not be a losing venture for the City. The time limit for a temporary event would also be expanded from 14 days to 30 days.

MR. DiFIORE explained that there is a correlation between this bill and Bill 2002-24, but this bill applies to a public convention/hotel facility having 150 or more rooms or a commercial building having at least 250,000 square feet, such as Cashman Center, with this bill, rather than with Bill 2002-24.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:46 – 4:50)

1-1522

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 4, 2002

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

Bill No. 2002-34 – Amends licensing, record keeping and reporting requirements for businesses.

Proposed by: Mark Vincent, Director of Finance and Business Services

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill permits the issuance of a mobile business license for those businesses not conducted exclusively from a fixed place of business. It also expands the record keeping requirements of certain businesses for City audit purposes. Currently, applicants for a business license must sign under pains and penalty of perjury that the information in the application is true. In the interest of uniformity with State licensing requirements, this bill removes this requirement and, instead, requires the applicant to acknowledge the truthfulness of the application.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-34

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2002-34 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation. COUNCILMAN BROWN concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing open.

JIM DiFIORE, Manager, Business Services, stated that this bill serves as a general clean up to the existing general licensing code. He listed the provisions: 1) the removal of requiring the applicant to sign under pains and penalties of perjury and requires the applicant to acknowledge that the information is true, current, and accurate; 2) mobile business license to be issued where

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2002

City Attorney

Item 6 – Bill No. 2002-34

MINUTES – Continued:

operations are conducted exclusively from a place other than a fixed place of business in the City; 3) cleans up the requirement for a separate license or permit for each branch establishment whether the activity is operated on a permit or a temporary basis; 4) updated record requirements from licensees; and 5) requires the licensee to declare the gross sales amount on his/her bill.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:50 – 4:53)

1-1674

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 4, 2002

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILLS:

Bill No. 2002-35 – Amends the City’s sewer regulations to add customer classes and revise the billing and collection provisions. Proposed by: Mark Vincent, Director of Finance and Business Services

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill will add a number of customer classes not previously recognized and revise definitions to make them consistent with those used by the Planning and Development Department. The bill will also improve the procedures for billing and collecting sewer service charges.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2002-35

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill 2002-35 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation. COUNCILMAN BROWN concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing open.

JIM DiFIORE, Manager, Business Services, said that the amendments contained in this bill are intended to improve as much as possible the definitions with regard to customer classes for commercial operators in the sewer code, correlating as much as possible with Planning Code definitions. COUNCILMAN BROWN confirmed with CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STEED that the bill was in order.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 4, 2002
City Attorney
Item 7 – Bill No. 2002-35

MINUTES – Continued:

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN BROWN declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:53 – 4:54)

1-1772



RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE AGENDA
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 4, 2002

ITEMS RAISED UNDER THIS PORTION OF THE AGENDA CANNOT BE DELIBERATED OR ACTED UPON UNTIL THE NOTICE PROVISIONS OF THE OPEN MEETING LAW HAVE BEEN MET. IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK ON A MATTER NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA, PLEASE CLEARLY STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS. IN CONSIDERATION OF OTHERS, AVOID REPETITION, AND LIMIT YOUR COMMENTS TO NO MORE THAN THREE (3) MINUTES. TO ENSURE ALL PERSONS EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK, EACH SUBJECT MATTER WILL BE LIMITED TO TEN (10) MINUTES.

MINUTES:

None.

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 4:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted: _____
GABRIELA S. PORTILLO-BRENNER
March 15, 2002